



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

comingly administered, we cannot adhere to what the edict proposes against the sacramentarians, seeing that the imperial edict did not speak of them, that they have not been heard, and that we cannot resolve upon such important points before the next council. Moreover—"and this is the essential part of the protest—"as the new edict declared that the ministers shall preach the gospel, explaining it according to the writings accepted by the holy Christian Church; we think that, for this regulation to have any value, we should first agree on what is meant by the true and holy Church. Now, seeing that there is great diversity of opinion in this respect; that there is no sure doctrine but such as is conformable to the Word of God; that the Lord forbids the teaching of any other doctrine; that each text of the Holy Scriptures ought to be explained by other and clearer texts; and that this holy book is in all things necessary for the Christian, easy of understanding, and calculated to scatter the darkness, we are resolved, with the grace of God, to maintain the pure and exclusive preaching of His only Word, such as it is contained in the biblical books of the Old and New Testament, without adding anything thereto that may be contrary to it. This Word is the only truth: it is the sure rule of all doctrine, and of all life, and can never fail or deceive us. He who builds on this foundation shall stand against all the powers of hell, whilst all the human vanities that are set up against it shall fall before the face of God.

"For these reasons, most dear lords, uncles, consins, and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we protest by these presents, before God, our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer, and Saviour, and who will one day be our judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and our people, neither consent nor adhere in any manner whatsoever to the proposed decree, in anything that is contrary to God, to His holy Word, to our right conscience, to the salvation of souls, and to the last decree of Spire.

"At the same time, we are in expectation that his imperial majesty will behave towards us like a Christian prince who loves God above all things; and we declare ourselves ready to pay unto him, as well as unto you, gracious lords, all the affection and obedience that are our just and legitimate duty."

Such was the famous *Protest* that henceforward gave the name of *Protestant* to the renovated Church; and thus spoke out those courageous men whom Christendom will for ever denominate the first Protestants.

It will be observed by all thoughtful readers that it was not a mere protest against Popish error, nor against any particular creed; it was nothing less than unfurling to the world the standard of those two great principles under which the battle of religious freedom is yet to be fought, that the civil power has no control over the consciences of men in matters of religion, and that the Word of God is the true rule and standard by which men ought to be guided in matters of faith.

The princes had barely finished their address when they announced their intention of quitting Spire on the morrow. But there was still a solemn form to be gone through to complete the Protest. King Ferdinand had not heard the declaration of the 19th of April, and a deputation of the evangelical states went the next day to present it to him. The King at first received it, but immediately after desired to return it. A strange scene ensued: the brother of Charles V. refusing to keep the protest, and the deputies refusing to take it back. At last the latter, out of respect, received it from Ferdinand's hands; but they laid it boldly upon the table and instantly retired from the hall.

"The King and the imperial commissioners (says the historian, Daubigne, to whom we are indebted for this most interesting document) remained in presence of this formidable writing. It was there, before their eyes—a significant monument of the courage and faith of the Protestants. Irritated against this silent but mighty witness, which accused his tyranny, and left him the responsibility of all the evils that were about to burst upon the empire, the brother of Charles V. called some of his councillors, and ordered them instantly to bring the document back to the Protestants.

"All, however, was unavailing: the protest had been registered in the annals of the world, and nothing could erase it. Liberty of thought and of conscience had been secured for after ages. The whole of evangelical Germany, foreseeing these results, was moved by this courageous act, and adopted it as the expression of its will and of its faith. Men in every quarter beheld in it not a mere political event, but a Christian action. The youthful electoral prince, John Frederick, in this respect the organ of his age, cried to the Protestants of Spire, 'May the Almighty, who has given you grace to confess energetically, freely, and fearlessly, preserve you in that Christian firmness until the day of eternity.'

There was but one thing more to be done—it was to give their solemn appeal a legal form.

On Sunday, 25th April, two notaries, Leonard Stetner, of Freysingen, and Pangrace Saltzman, of Bamberg, were seated at a small table in a narrow chamber on the ground floor of a house situated in St. John's-lane, near the church of the same name, in Spire, and around them were the chancellors of the princes and of the evangelical cities, with several witnesses.

This little house belonged to an humble pastor, Peter Mutterstalt, deacon of St. John's, who offered a domicile for the important act that was preparing. The document having been drawn up, one of the notaries began reading it—"Since there is a natural communion between all men," it commenced, "and since even persons condemned to death are permitted to unite and appeal

against their condemnation, how much more are we, who are members of the same spiritual body, the Church of the Son of God, children of the same Heavenly Father, and, consequently, brothers in the Spirit, authorized to unite when our salvation and eternal condemnation are concerned." It then proceeded to review all that had passed at the diet, and after recording all the principal documents that had reference to it, it ended as follows—"We, therefore, appeal for ourselves, for our subjects, and for all who receive, or who shall hereafter receive, the Word of God, from all past, present, or future vexatious measures, to his Imperial Majesty, and to a free and universal assembly of holy Christendom." The document filled twelve sheets of parchment, the signatures and seals were affixed to the thirteenth.

The princes and states which joined in this protest were, the Elector John of Saxony, the Margrave George of Brandenburg, Ansbach and Cuhmbach, the Dukes Ernest and Francis of Luneburg, the Landgrave Philip of Hesse-Cassel, Wolfgang, prince of Anhalt; and 14 imperial cities, viz., Strasbourg, Ulm, Nuremberg, Constance, Reutlingen, Windsheim, Memmingen, Lindau, Kempten, Heilbronn, Lang, Weissenberg, Nordlingen, and St. Gall.

"The Reformation," says the same eloquent writer, Merle D'Aubigne, "had now taken a bodily form. It was Luther alone who said no at the diet of Worms; but churches and ministers, princes and people, said no at the diet of Spire."

CALVIN AND SERVETUS.

OF a certain class of controversialists it may be said that if one of them inveighs against persecution and intolerance in matters of faith or opinion, he points his moral by a reference to Geneva; or if an allusion is made in his presence to the horrors of the Inquisition, it is met with the question, "Who burned Servetus?" We have even heard the merciful dealings with its victims of the holy office contrasted with the execution of this first martyr of the Reformation, as some of our readers may remember was done not very long since by one of the professors in the so-called Catholic University of Dublin, in a prelection whose objects seemed to be to prove that heresy is hostile to science, while its true friends are the members of the true Church; and that freedom of opinion, like liberty of conscience, flourishes only in the genial atmosphere of Rome.

We are far from saying the learned professor ventured to assert that Servetus suffered death for his physiological discoveries; it rather appeared to us that such an assertion was needed for the comparison sought to be instituted between his case and that of Galileo, who was persecuted solely on account of his devotion to science, as well as to justify the introduction of his name and history upon such an occasion, and before a mixed audience.

The casting aspersions on the character of the advocates of truth has always been a favourite weapon with its opponents. It was so from the beginning of Christianity; and as the early Christians did not escape calumny (as the pages of Gibbon testify), neither did the great authors of the Reformation. Witness the numerous imputations on the moral character and sanity of Luther, and this weighty charge of persecution and cruelty which has rested for centuries upon the memory of one so noted for his opposition to the Church of Rome—"the implacable Calvin," "that most cruel and atrocious monster," as his accusers term him. We must do the Roman Catholic writers the justice to admit that, as will presently appear, they are not the original authors of this accusation, or of these vituperative expressions. On the contrary, Bayle writes—"The Catholics have acknowledged the falsity of all those infamous calumnies where with they have branded his conduct;" and, speaking of Bolsec's life of Calvin, he says—"It will suffice for an eternal conviction of his calumnies, that there are among the Catholics several grave authors who have not in the least countenanced his reports, which is a demonstrative proof that they are built upon no foundation."

It is more especially by the writers of a certain school in our own country that the strongest expressions have been used. Thus, Hallam says, "Servetus became a victim to the bigotry of the magistrates of Geneva, instigated by Calvin, who had acquired an immense ascendancy over that republic; and he (Calvin) has never recovered in the eyes of posterity the blow this gave to his moral reputation, which the Arminians as well as the Socinians were always anxious to depreciate."

Sigmond says—"The best proof that Calvin and Melancthon had deserted the mild, the charitable, the peaceful religion of truth, and that they followed not the divine precepts of their gentle Master, was and is that they persecuted, even unto death, a helpless, poor, and learned man."

Lastly, the writer of the articles, Calvin and Servetus, in the Penny Cyclopaedia, says—"His (Calvin's) conduct toward Servetus has drawn down upon him the epithet of a most cruel and atrocious monster; and no act of barbarity perpetrated by the Roman Catholics ever surpassed the

burning of Servetus, in which Calvin filled all the parts of informer, prosecutor, and judge."

Now, we freely admit, that, if this last statement were true, we should regard Calvin as inexcusable, and should consider the plea often urged that he acted but in conformity to the spirit of his time, as insufficient even for extenuation of his guilt. We are led, however, by a careful examination of the circumstances connected with the trial and condemnation of Servetus to regard Calvin as his bold and unsparing accuser certainly, and no less as the fearless and inflexible witness for the truth against its able opponent; but not as his prosecutor, and in no respect as his judge, or even possessed of the power to influence the judgment of those by whom he was tried. We would not, however, have it supposed that in what we are about to say in defence of Calvin we feel it to be at all necessary to our case that we should be able to exculpate him either wholly or in part from the charges brought against him in this matter. Our cause does not require that either he or any other Reformer should have been men of unspotted fame. We base our creed on no human authority, but on the written revelation of God's will; and in what we are about to say we are therefore influenced only by the love of truth.

We shall freely borrow from an interesting brochure by Mons. Rilliet, of Geneva, translated a few years since by the Rev. W. K. Tweedie, of Edinburgh,^a in which the Reformer's share in the proceeding seems to us to be impartially stated, as ascertained from unexceptionable sources; the original records of the trial having been for the first time carefully examined for this purpose.

Servetus was born about the year 1509, at Villanova, in Arragon. From his youth he displayed a decided taste for religious speculations, in which he appears to have indulged while studying the law in the University of Toulouse. Soon after, in 1531, he published his first theological work, entitled *De Trinitatis Erroribus*, in which he attacked the doctrine of the Trinity. In the following year he published another work of the same character. "One sees," says Rilliet, "the theories there appearing which he afterwards developed at length, and which affected the whole of Christianity. These writings spread by degrees in Germany and Italy, where they were not without partisans."

Meeting with no sympathy or encouragement from the leading Reformers, Servetus thought it desirable to change his name and his profession. Assuming the name Villeneuve, he became a student of Medicine, in Paris, where he is said^b to have made the discovery of the circulation of the blood. He appears to have left Paris about the year 1538, under a sentence of Parliament, and after living for some time near Lyons, to have settled at Vienne, in Dauphine, in the year 1540, where he practised as a physician. But the bent of his mind was still to theology, and in 1553 the result of the labour of years appeared in his great work which he entitled *Christianismi Restitutio*, and which embraces all the ideas, theoretical and practical, by which Servetus proposed to displace what he terms the monstrous errors of the Romish Church and the pretended reforms of the Protestant doctors, both being equally opposed, according to him, to the spirit of the Gospel and to primitive Christianity.

The book found its way to Geneva, and on the 26th of February, 1553, a French refugee named William de Trie, a friend of Calvin, residing there, denounced the work of Servetus to a relation who lived at Lyons; sent him the first sheet, reproaching him at the same time for the want of zeal among the Catholics in repressing such blasphemies, while they persecuted the teachers of the Protestant faith; and pointed out as the author the physician practising at Vienne, under the name of Villeneuve. The Lyonsese transmitted the information to the Inquisitor of the diocese, and Servetus was exposed to a rigorous examination. Not having proof of the authorship, the Lyonsese applied to De Trie for more ample information, who replied by sending some letters written by Servetus himself to Calvin, in which he explained his change of name. This made Servetus regard Calvin as the true accuser, an imputation which was formally repelled by the latter.

Upon the receipt of these proofs Servetus was arrested, and on the 5th and 6th of April, 1553, he underwent examination before a tribunal composed of ecclesiastics and laymen, where he gave replies utterly contrary to the truth, and was at last convicted by means of his own handwriting. By the aid of his friends he found means to escape from the prison of Vienne on the 7th of April, but the trial was proceeded with, and on the 17th of June a sentence was pronounced condemning him to the flames. On the same day, his effigy and a bale of copies of his book were burned in the market-place by the hands of the executioner. That the court of Vienne would have carried the sentence into effect had Servetus remained in their power appears from the answer returned to the application from the Council of Geneva, for a copy of the proceedings against him. "The president and

^a Its original title is, "Relation du process Criminel Intente a Geneve en 1553, contre Michel Servet, redige d'apres les documents originaux par Albert Rilliet."

^b By some it has been said that Servetus anticipated our countryman Harvey, in the discovery of the circulation; such, however, is not the case. Servetus knew that the septum of the heart is not perforated, as Galen had taught, but that the blood in the right ventricle enters the left through the pulmonary veins, after passing through the lungs. He was, however, quite ignorant of the systemic circulation, by means of which the blood distributed to all parts of the body returns to the right ventricle.—See art. Servetus, Penny Cyclopaedia.

^a Histoire de la Reformation. Tom. iv., chap. vi., p. 104.

^b Historical and Critical Dictionary; article, Calvin.

^c Introduction to the Literature of Europe, vol. i., p. 507; vol. ii., p. 107.

^d Unnoticed theories of Servetus—introduction.

attorney informed the council that it was not possible to grant its request as to communicating the papers in the process instituted at Vienne against Servetus, because as that trial had terminated by a sentence of condemnation, they could not concede or consent that another judgment should be passed, under pain of incurring the displeasure of the king." They contented themselves, therefore, with transmitting a copy of the sentence of death pronounced against M. Servetus, under the name of Villeneuve; and in their turn requested that the prisoner might be sent back to them, "to inflict the said sentence, the execution of which would punish him in such a way that there would be no need to seek other charges against him."

In the expectation that the surrender of Servetus would be conceded, the magistrate and attorney had charged the officer or governor of the prison of Vienne, from which Servetus escaped, to whom they had given credentials, to reconduct him to that city.

That Servetus did not hope for clemency from his former judges is evident from his answer to the council. "When confronted with the officer under whose custody he had been imprisoned at Vienne, and asked, Do you prefer to remain here in the hands of my lords, or to be sent back with this jailor who has come to demand you? he threw himself on the ground, and weeping, he implored them to try him at Geneva, and not to send him back to Vienne."

For three months after his escape Servetus remained concealed in France, but fearing if he prolonged his stay that he might fall into the hands of justice, he fled to Geneva, which city he reached towards the end of July.

To form an estimate of the probable motives which led Servetus to Geneva, and of the causes which led to his condemnation there, it is necessary to notice the condition of affairs and the state of parties in the republic at the period of these occurrences. It is important first to observe, that in Geneva the Reformation was not merely, or even primarily, a change of ecclesiastical, but of civil polity. "The pursuit of liberty," says Rilliet, "engrossed the citizens long before they had heard of the new doctrines, and when these were preached, they were hailed chiefly as a means of freeing Geneva from the supremacy of its bishops, and of securing for it the protection of Berne." The reformation accomplished, the citizens of Geneva, accustomed to a life of licentiousness, dissipation, and pleasure, while under the rule of their Romish bishops, fretted under the severe and strict discipline of Calvin. In his own language, "many to whom the first look of pure and sound doctrine was welcome were, in course of time, offended when they met it; few were found to bend the neck to carry with pleasure the yoke of Jesus Christ." But few of the native Genevese ever sincerely embraced the doctrines or conformed to the practice of Calvin, whose adherents were, for the most part, like himself, refugees, chiefly French. The consequence of this state of things was, that for years the governing body in Geneva was hostile to Calvin; that at one time he was banished from the city; and that though the party who banished the Reformer found it necessary to recall him, the conflict between Calvin and the Libertines continued for years with varying fortunes, until at length his ascendancy was completely established, and the very men who had overturned the government of the bishop of Geneva and banished the priests, were themselves, almost to a man, expelled from the city.

It is next to be observed that Servetus arrived in Geneva at the moment when this contest between Calvin and the Libertines was at its height. We accordingly find his cause warmly espoused by the latter, one of their leaders, Berthelier, coming forward as his advocate and the accuser of Calvin at the trial, and another, Perrin, doing his utmost as president of the council which tried Servetus to obtain a decree of acquittal.

The above considerations, with others which might be adduced, lead us to agree with Rilliet that the state of parties in Geneva, and the existence there of numerous enemies to the Reformer, upon whom he reckoned as sympathizers and allies, induced Servetus to visit that city, where he was identified and arrested on the 18th August, 1553. Calvin does not deny that it was at his suit the arrest took place. The man who he considered the greatest enemy to the Reformation was in Geneva, and the danger of his presence was such in the existing state of the Church as to demand his removal. "To tolerate Servetus with impunity at Geneva would have been, in some measure, for Calvin to exile himself. It would have been to betray the cause of God without a struggle; to belie all the past, and render impossible the continuation of his work at Geneva."

On Monday, the 14th, at a preliminary inquest held by the lieutenant of the city, articles of accusation were presented by Nicholas de la Fontaine, a friend and acknowledged agent of Calvin, and on the following day the lieutenant transmitted to the syndics in council an abstract of his examination; Fontaine at the same time presenting a memorial praying that upon proof that Servetus had written and taught the heresies of which he (Fontaine) accused him, the prosecution should be entrusted to the procurator fiscal, by order of the council, and he (Fontaine)

be freed from all expense, injury, or risk. "Not because he shuns or refuses to prosecute such a cause and quarrel, which all Christians and children of God ought to maintain even unto death; but because he understands that the usages and customs of your city warrant that; and because it belongs not to him to undertake the duty and office of another."

Fontaine and Servetus being summoned before the council, the latter was interrogated as to his past life and doctrines; the only thing worthy of remark in the course of the proceedings being a dexterous attempt on his part to induce the council to forego a trial before their bar in favour of a public disputation with Calvin, who, on his part, agreed and protested "there was nothing that he more desired than to plead such a cause in the temple before all the people."

The council, according to Rilliet, refused, fearing "that it would thus dispossess itself of the cognizance of an affair which stood connected with the prerogatives of which it had recently appeared so jealous. On the other hand, the friends of Servetus among the magistrates might fear to see their protégé defeated by Calvin, whose word was much more powerful, and thus have their own hands fettered in the final judgment by the result of the discussion. The spirit of domination, and that of prudence, thus induced the council to deny the conference which Servetus desired."

On the 16th, the time of the court seems to have been occupied by a fierce recriminatory attack upon Calvin by Berthelier, who appeared on the part of Servetus; and on the 17th, the Reformer, for the first time, appeared in person, alleging as a ground for demanding audience that he understood that Berthelier had interfered to plead in excuse and defence of the doctrines of Servetus.

At this stage of the proceedings Servetus appears to have avowed his opinions without reservation, such expressions as the following being used by him:—"The baptism of little infants is a diabolical invention—an infernal falsehood to destroy the whole of Christianity; that the doctrine of the Trinity was a cerberus, the dream of St. Augustine, and an invention of the devil; that all creatures are of the substance of God, and that all things are full of infinite Gods."

With this day's proceedings ended the first stage of the trial. The result, so far, was unfavourable to Servetus; the interference of Berthelier, and his attack upon Calvin, had been injurious, and the council resolved that Fontaine's allegations having been proved, he should be liberated, and the attorney-general be instructed to prosecute, the following resolution being adopted:—"Inasmuch as the case of heresy of M. Servetus vitally affects the welfare of Christendom, it is resolved to proceed with his trial, and also to write to Vienne to know why he was imprisoned and how he escaped; and after that, when all is ascertained, to write to the magistrates of Berne, of Bale, of Zurich, of Schaffhausen, and other churches of the Swiss, to acquaint them with the whole."

On the 23rd of August, Claude Rigot presented the indictment which he had prepared, as public prosecutor; it was entitled, "The interrogations and articles upon which the attorney-general of this city of Geneva desires to question Michael Servetus, a prisoner guilty of blasphemies, of heresies, and of disturbing Christendom." "In this public prosecution and condemnation of Servetus," says Rilliet, "no account was taken of his altercations with the Reformer; the position of the latter had changed too much for any offence against him to be reckoned as a crime. If Servetus had had in the eyes of Genevese justice no other fault than that of which De la Fontaine declared him guilty in regard to Calvin, his acquittal had been sure. . . . Servetus was tried and condemned by a majority of his judges, not at all as the opponent of Calvin—scarcely as a heretic—but essentially as seditious. Politics acted a much more important part than theology towards the close of his trial; they came on the stage with the attorney-general. The articles drawn up by him were prepared on the avowed conviction that Servetus had always been a fiery and dangerous spirit, whose constant endeavours had tended to the entire disorganizing of Christendom." As this part of the proceedings had no reference to Calvin, we pass to what may be termed the third phase of the trial.

On the 31st of August, and on the day following, communications were received by the council, which appear to have had their influence on the fate of the prisoner. The first was in answer to the letter addressed to the court of Vienne, a copy of the sentence of death pronounced by that court, and a demand that Servetus should be given up. The next was a letter from M. de Mangiron, lieutenant-general of the King of France, in Dauphiné, declaring "that he was happy to learn Servetus was in the hands of the magistrates of Geneva, who, he was assured, would take better care than the ministers of Vienne had done, and do such justice as that he would not again have the means of teaching or publishing his false, heretical doctrines."

"Who knows," asks Rilliet, "to what extent the fear of appearing worse Christians and less scrupulous magistrates than the people of Vienne operated on the minds of the Genevese judges?" Be this as it may, while the council refused to give up a prisoner charged with crimes till a sentence of acquittal or condemnation should be

pronounced—such refusal being according to the ancient usages of Geneva—they caused to be written a gracious letter, intimating that they could not give him up, but would do full justice upon him.

In accordance with the resolution of the 21st of August, the Swiss churches were now to be consulted; and that they might be fully informed on the case, the council ordered that Calvin should extract, and give in (written in Latin), the articles, word for word, which are in the book of the said Servetus. The prisoner was to give in his answers and vindications also in Latin, and Calvin in his turn was to furnish replies. These documents were to be submitted to the churches.

It is highly important, with a view to determine Calvin's precise share in the melancholy transaction, to ascertain the nature of his relations with the council at this period. Were they such as to justify the language of Hallam, that Servetus "became a victim to the bigotry of the magistrates, instigated by Calvin, who had acquired an immense ascendancy over that republic?" If so, the Reformer would be justly said by another writer to have filled all the parts of an informer, prosecutor, and judge; and in reply to the question, who burned Servetus? we should reply, Calvin and his adherents. Or, were those relations rather such as to make the council desirous to prosecute the matter on their own account, and in the exercise of a power independent of Calvin, who, at this stage, they used as their instrument for communicating with the other churches against his own will? This latter is the view which Rilliet takes, and we think justly; in fact, it is forced upon us by the occurrences taking place in the council at the time; by its composition, and by the conduct and bearing of Calvin and Servetus at this period. Bayle tells us that when, after many solicitations, Calvin re-entered Geneva, "to the infinite satisfaction of the people and magistracy, the first thing he did was to establish a form of discipline, and a consistorial jurisdiction, which had power to exercise canonical censures and punishments, even to excommunication. This displeased a great many, who urged that it was a means to restore the Roman tyranny; however, the thing was executed." But though the new canon passed into a law in a general assembly of the people (November 20, 1541), it was stoutly resisted by the leaders of the Libertines, and at the period of Servetus' trial, at which we are arrived, the contest between these men, backed by the council on the one side, and Calvin and the consistory on the other, was at its height; for, on the very same day on which the order for confronting Calvin and Servetus, to which we have alluded, was made, the council granted to Philibert Berthelier, who had been excommunicated by the consistory, their warrant to partake of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in spite of this prohibition. This resolution, which reversed the whole system of ecclesiastical discipline established by Calvin, sufficiently showed the animus of the council towards him, and was regarded by Calvin as a triumph of his enemies, led by Perrin, who was at the time president of the council. Of the composition of this body, we learn that among the 20 members who pronounced judgment upon Servetus, seven only were Calvinists. We do not here see any proofs of "immense ascendancy," nor does the bearing of Calvin furnish such.

At the meeting of the council, when anxious that reference should not be made to the other Swiss Churches, he did not venture openly to oppose it, and the task imposed on him by the council was simply that he should extract and give in "word for word (in Latin), the articles which are in the book of the said Servetus." So far from Calvin being now on the eve of a triumph, it was by no means certain that he would not again be driven into exile. That he himself considered this not unlikely, appears from his sermons and letters during this period. "I must declare to you that I know not but this may be the last sermon I shall preach in Geneva," was his language in the pulpit on the 3rd of September; while he writes to Bullinger, "In a little the council will send the opinions of Servetus to obtain your advice. It is in spite of us that they have given you this trouble; but they have arrived at that pitch of madness and rage that they look with suspicion on all that we say," &c. The answer of Bullinger proves the despondency of Calvin. "Do not abandon, I conjure you, a church which contains so many excellent men. Ever support the cause of the elect; think of the joy which your withdrawal would occasion to the enemies of reform, and with what dangers it would be accompanied to the French refugees."

But there seems also every proof that Servetus looked upon his trial as a contest between himself and Calvin, before a tribunal favourable to him, and hostile to his accuser, and likely, therefore, to result in his own triumph and the other's punishment. The memorial which he presented to the council on the 22nd September, containing articles of impeachment against Calvin, concludes thus: "Wherefore, like a magician as he is, he ought not to be merely condemned, but to be exterminated and hunted from your city; and his goods ought to be confiscated to me in return for mine which he has caused me to lose, which things, my lords, I request from you." The same tone of fierce and contemptuous hostility to one who he considered himself on the eve of vanquishing marks his replies to the articles extracted from his book by Calvin, commencing thus: "The title 'minister' makes me marvel at the impudence of the man who boasts of being a

Catholic, although he is a disciple of Simon the magician, as I have evidently shown in my apology. Who will say that an 'accusator criminal' and a homicide is a true minister of the church?" &c.

Well may Rilliet say, "To treat Calvin thus within the walls of a prison was to be very sure of victory; to rush into a path at the end of which the defeat of his adversary seemed to be almost certain. Circumstances warranted this hope of Servetus, so that in all that followed of his defence he addressed himself directly to Calvin, as if he had no longer any terms to keep with him, and apostrophized him thus from his pride of place. "You do not know what you say. You are a wretch, if you persist in condemning what you do not understand. Did you think to stan the ears of the judges by your barking? You have a confused intellect, so that you cannot understand the truth. Wretch! perverted by Simon Magus, you are ignorant of the first principles of things. You make men only blocks of wood and stone by establishing the slavery of the will." "Moreover," adds Rilliet, "far from equivocating or resorting to subterfuges, as in the oral debate, Servetus expressly grants the opinions that were imputed to him, and his brief and proud replies are altogether in harmony with the state of mind which the rest of his apologetic plea betrays. Already he believed Calvin to be dethroned, and saw himself placed in safety. The opposition of the council in favour of Berthelier had turned the head of Servetus."

On the 20th of October, the answers of the Swiss churches were laid before the council. They were unanimous in their condemnation of the doctrines of Servetus; while the governments of Berne and Zurich advised his punishment. In a letter to Bullinger, Haller states that the magistrates of Berne had seriously exhorted the council of Geneva to remove that scourge, that their own territory might not be infected. "It was, in fact," says Rilliet, "this advice of the Bernese government, more precisely expressed, no doubt, than in their official letter, which Calvin asserts in two places exercised the greatest influence on the judges of Servetus."

The council of Geneva had still too much the habit of yielding to that of Berne to refuse a sentence which they prompted with a view to their government and as a matter of policy."

Calvin appears to have anticipated the effect of these letters on the council, and affirms in the most solemn manner at this stage, that he sought to exert no influence on the minds of his judges to obtain a sentence of death against Servetus. At the meeting of the 26th October, this sentence was adopted after a stormy discussion, Amied Perrin, the president, insisting that he should be declared innocent and discharged as acquitted; four others voted with Perrin. Seven Calvinists were present, and the remaining nine might be termed neutrals, whose vote is thus accounted for by Rilliet: "The unanimity of the Swiss churches in condemning Servetus; his attacks against doctrines till then held sacred in every communion; among others against the Trinity and the baptism of infants; his condemnation at Vienne as an impious blasphemer; the promises of justice given to the magistrates of that city; the exhortations to severity received from those of Zurich and Berne; the troubles which the partisans of novel opinions had already produced in the churches of the reformation: all these contributed to separate the guilt of Servetus from his rivalry with Calvin in the minds of the judges, and to make them forget the theologian, to think only of the criminal." Need further proof be adduced that Calvin was not in this case at once accuser, prosecutor, and judge?

The act itself seems to have excited little attention and less censure at the time. The enemies of Calvin do not appear to have then attacked him as they have since done; even his great slanderer, the man whom he had caused to be banished, Bolsec, declares he felt "no displeasure at the death of so obstinate and monstrous a heretic; for he was utterly vile and unworthy of the society of men," &c. Rilliet regards the tardy scandal this execution has occasioned "as a tribute offered to the spirit of the reformation; for it is, perhaps, less the rigour of the judges than their inconsistency which has given such notoriety to the death of Servetus. Everywhere else but in a reformed city he might have perished without his memory recalling anything but a funeral pile and a victim. At Geneva he could not lose his life without becoming the representative of a cause and the martyr of a principle."

We are far, indeed, from attempting to justify the cruel sentence, a counterpart of the countless sacrifices of that Inquisition, with whose mild and merciful treatment of its illustrious victims we have been invited to contrast it.

We loathe persecution under any circumstances, and will never become its apologists whoever be persecutor. So far as Calvin was really concerned in the sad tragedy of Servetus, we cannot and will not defend him. He was his accuser, and doubtless wished his death. The spirit and mode of thinking of the age in which he lived might, perhaps, supply some extenuation for both the accuser and the judges of Servetus, but we are far from justifying either. That the majority of those judges were not Calvin's friends or under his influence, we have abundantly shown in the foregoing statement; nor can we believe that even had he desired it, Calvin could have

effected a remission or even a mitigation of his sentence. It is but common justice to exculpate Calvin from the charge of being both the prosecutor and the judge of Servetus; but, on the other hand, we unhesitatingly admit that the part he did take in it was inconsistent with the principles of freedom of thought and action, which are, and we trust ever will be, the characteristics of true Protestantism. We might, doubtless, say much to diminish the sympathy excited by Servetus's sufferings by showing that he was not the mere "poor, helpless, learned man" Dr. Sigmond would represent him; but one of those restless, fiery spirits that delight in fomenting strife and courting danger, one of whom Coleridge might say with truth that "if any poor fanatic ever thrust himself into the flames, that man was Servetus."

We cannot condescend, however, to palliate a public crime, by dilating on or aggravating the guilt of the victim. Such would be but one of the devices by which men have too often attempted to conceal from themselves or others their wicked violations of religious liberty.

It might be said, as it has often been said before, that notorious heresy, such as that of Servetus, must be cauterised at any price; as gangrenes must be cut out and cauterised for the good of the body; but the time is gone by when any one can be deluded into the belief that men's bodies should be brought to the stake for the good of their souls, or the holy name of religion perverted into a sanction or cover for human prejudice or passion, and we would as soon attempt to defend the fiendish atrocities of Hindoo or Mahomedan superstition, recently perpetrated at Delhi or Meerut, by representing their European governors as religious proselytizers or political oppressors, as to justify the burning of Servetus because he was either a propagator of heresy or an enemy to the social tranquility of Geneva, even if the character of one of the leaders of the Reformed Church were more deeply implicated in it than we have shown it to be.

EGO ABSOLVO TE—I ABSOLVE THEE.—No. II.

In our last number we gave the forms of absolution used in the Greek Church for TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS and more from the time of Christ. We showed that all those forms consisted in praying to God for the pardon of sin, as that which HE ALONE could give.

We now proceed to give the forms of absolution in the Church of Rome for twelve hundred years after Christ.

We call on all Roman Catholics to read and study this; for it concerns the remission of their sins. It concerns them to know whether they trust in a true or a false method for the forgiveness of their sins; and here we give them the testimony of the Church of Rome herself, in her public and authorised forms and ceremonies for TWELVE HUNDRED YEARS.

We call on all Roman Catholic bishops and priests in Ireland to read—and to answer this paper, if they can. Our pages, of course, are open to publish their answer.

The oldest existing records of the liturgy and rites of the Church of Rome are contained in what are called the "Sacramentaries" of Pope Leo, Pope Gelasius, and Pope Gregory. Leo succeeded in the year 440; Gelasius in 492; and Gregory in 590.

Whether the sacramentary of Leo be really his, is only matter of conjecture. In all these sacramentaries there are prayers inserted which are of later date than the popes whose names they bear. But it is not necessary to insist on this for our present argument; for the "forms of absolution" in these sacramentaries continued in use in the Church of Rome until the twelfth or thirteenth centuries.

The sacramentary of Pope Leo, which is much less perfect than the others, does not contain, so far as we have been able to find, any "forms of absolution."

The sacramentary of Pope Gelasius gives those forms very fully.

The sacramentary of Pope Gregory gives them in a shorter space, and evidently taken from that of Gelasius.

We take these sacramentaries (as we do in all cases) from the best authority that we can find—viz., the learned work of the Roman Catholic writer Muratori, "Liturgia Romana vetus," &c. Ed. Venet. 1748.

Not finding any "forms of absolution" in the "Sacramentary of Leo," we proceed to that of Pope Gelasius; and there we find (vol. i., p. 504, No. xv.) "ENTREATIES AND PRAYERS OVER PENITENTS:"—

"Hear, O Lord, our prayers, and pardon the sins of those who confess to Thee, that those whose consciences guilt accuses, the compassion of THY indulgence may absolve; through our Lord, &c."

"O Lord, we beseech Thee, let Thy mercy be beforehand with this Thy servant, and let all his sins be blotted out with speedy indulgence; through, &c."

"Be present, O Lord, to our supplications, and let not the compassion of Thy clemency be far from this Thy servant. Heal his wounds and remit his sins, that, being separated from Thee by no iniquities, he may always be able to cleave to Thee, his Lord; through, &c."

"O Lord our God, who art not overcome by our offences, but art appeased by satisfaction, look, we beseech Thee, upon this Thy servant, who confesses that he has grievously sinned against Thee. It belongs to Thee to give the cleansing of crimes, and to grant pardon to those who sin; who hast said that Thou wouldst rather the re-

pentance than the death of sinners. Grant this, therefore, Lord, that both he may celebrate the watches of repentance to Thee; that his acts being corrected, he may be had in estimation to attribute joys to Thee before Thee for ever."

"I pray Thee, O Lord, of the clemency of Thy majesty and name, that Thou wouldst think fit to grant pardon to this Thy servant confessing his sins and misdeeds, and to set him free from his past offences, who broughtest back on Thy shoulders the lost sheep to the folds; who wert appeased at the prayers or confession of the publican; do Thou also, O Lord, be appeased with this Thy servant; do Thou, benign, be present to his prayers, that, continuing in confession with weeping, he may more quickly obtain by entreaty Thy clemency; and being restored to Thy holy and sacred altars, may be reformed again to the hope of eternal and celestial glory; through, &c."

In these prayers the priest does not attempt to say "I absolve thee;" he only prays to God that God Himself will remit the sins of the penitent, as if that were a work which GOD ALONE could do, and which priests could only pray for.

In page 549, the "Sacramentary" of Gelasius gives:

"THE ORDER FOR THOSE DOING PUBLIC PENANCE."

"In which, as before, the priest is directed to say:—
Do Thou heal his wounds; do Thou stretch forth a saving hand to him prostrate. . . . Do Thou spare him, confessing."

Also to the penitent to be reconciled:—

"Almighty, everlasting God, for Thy goodness release his sins to this Thy servant confessing to Thee; that guilt of conscience may not hurt him more to punishment than the indulgence of Thy goodness to pardon."

"Almighty and merciful God, who hast placed indulgence of sins in a speedy confession, succour the fallen; pity those who confess; that those whom the chain of sins binds, the greatness of Thy goodness may absolve."

"O God, who purifiest the hearts of those who confess to Thee, and absolvest from all bond of iniquity those who accuse their own conscience, grant pardon to the guilty, and give medicine to the wounded, that having received remission of all their sins, they may afterwards remain in true devotion."

"Holy Lord, Father omnipotent, eternal Lord, look upon this Thy servant, . . . and grant a remedy to him confessing, salvation to him repenting, and the aid of soundness to him wounded."

But no trace appears in this ORDER of the form, *I absolve thee*.

In page 552, the "Sacramentary" of Gelasius gives:

"THE RECONCILIATION OF A PENITENT AT DEATH."

Here, at least, we should expect that the highest power of the priest in forgiving sins should be exercised. Yet here, as well as everywhere else, the priest's office is executed only in prayer to God, that HE will pardon sin; but without any trace of the words "I absolve thee."

"O merciful God, O clement God, who, according to the multitude of Thy mercies, dost put away the sins of those who repent, and makest void the faults of past crimes by the pardon of remission, look upon this Thy servant, and, being entreated, hear him asking for himself, with whole confession of heart, the remission of all his sins. Renew in him, most loving Father, whatever is corrupted by earthly frailty, or whatever is defiled by the fraud of the devil; restore him to the unity of the

A ORAT ET PRECES SUPER PENITENTES.

Exaudi, Domine, preces nostras; et contentium tibi parce peccatis: ut quos conscientie reatus accusat, indulgentie tue misericordia absolvat. Per.

Præveniat hunc famulum tuum, quæsumus, Domine misericordia tua: et omnes iniquitates ejus celeri indulgentia deleantur. Per Dominum nostrum.

Adesto, Domine, supplicationibus nostris; nec sit ab hoc famulo tuo clementia tua longinqua misericordia. Sana vulnera, ejusque remitte peccata: ut nullis te iniquitatibus separatus, tibi semper Domino valeat adherere. Per. Domine Deus noster, qui offensioe nostra non vincis, sed satisfactione placaris: respice, quæsumus, ad hunc famulum tuum, qui se tibi peccasse graviter confitetur. Tuum est absolutioem criminum dare, et veniam præstare peccantibus: qui dixisti penitentiam te male peccatorum quam mortem. Concede ergo Domine hoc: ut tibi penitentia excubias celebret; ut, correctis actibus suis, conferre tibi ad sempiterni glaudia celebretur. Per.

Precor, Domine, clementiam tue majestatis ac nominis: ut hunc famulo tuo peccata et facinora sua contenti veniam dare, et præteritorum criminum relaxare digneris. Qui humeris tuis ovem perditam reduxisti ad caulas: qui publicani preibus vel confessione placatus es: Tu etiam, Domine, et hunc famulo tuo placare: tu ejus preibus be ignis addeste: ut in confessione devili permanens clementiam tuam celeriter exoret: et sanctis ac sacris altariis restitutus, spei rursus æ erum, et ceteris is gloriæ reformetur. Per.

Muratori, Liturgia Romana, &c. Vol. i. p. 504, 505. Ed. Venet. 1748.

B ORDO AGENTIS PUBLICI AM PENITENTIAM.

Tu ejus medere vulneribus. Tu jacenti manum porriges salutarem. Tu prece contenti

Item ad reconciliandum penitentem.
Omnipotens omnipotens Deus, contenti tibi hunc famulo tuo pro tua pietate peccata relaxa: ut non plus ei noceat conscientia reatus ad penam, quam indulgentia tua pietatis ad veniam. Per. Do.
Omnipotens et misericors Deus, qui peccatorum indulgentiam in confessione celeri p'sultis; succurre lapsis: miserere confitentibus quos delictorum catena constringit, magnitudo tue pietatis absoluit. Per.

Deus qui contentium tibi corda purificas, et accens nites suas conscientias ab omni vinculo iniquitatis abolvit: da indulgentiam reus; et medicinam tribue vulneratis: ut perceptive remissione omnium peccatorum, sinceræ deinceps devotione permaneat.

Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus, respice super hunc famulum tuum et mediam contenti, salutem penitentem, et vulnerato auxilium sanitatis indulgeas.
Muratori, Vol. i. p. 519, &c.

¹ Rilliet, p. 202, Calvin's language is most explicit:—"From the time he was convicted of his heresies, I have made no endeavour to have his punishment made capital, and not merely all honest men will be witnesses of what I say, but I challenge all the malignants to say if it is not so."—Declaration, p. 1318.